Understanding social identity and intrateam moral behavior in competitive youth ice hockey

Bruner, Mark W.; Boardley, Ian; Forrest, Christopher ; Root, Zach ; Allen, Veronica; Côte, Jean

DOI:
10.1123/tsp.2015-0117

Understanding Social Identity and Intrateam Moral Behavior in Competitive Youth Ice Hockey: A Narrative Perspective

Date Resubmitted: November 02 2016

Date Resubmitted: September 6, 2016

Date Resubmitted: June 30, 2016

Date Submitted: October 20, 2015

Abstract

Social identity has been found to play a salient role in regulating teammate behavior among youth participating in a range of sports (Bruner, Boardley, & Côté, 2014). This study aimed to better understand social identity by examining how it may influence intrateam moral behavior specifically in competitive youth ice hockey. Thirty-six male and female competitive youth ice hockey players from nine teams participated in narrative interviews. Using a thematic narrative analysis, three distinct narratives were identified: (1) family-oriented team narrative, (2) performance-oriented team narrative, and (3) dominance-oriented team narrative. Within each of the narratives, a reciprocal relationship between social identity and intrateam moral behavior was reported such that young athletes' social identities developed through team membership may influence and be influenced by their moral behavior toward teammates. Collectively, the results extend previous research by providing an in-depth qualitative understanding of social identity and intrateam moral behavior in youth sport.

Keywords: group dynamics, prosocial behavior, antisocial behavior, team sport

Understanding Social Identity and Moral Behavior in Competitive Youth Ice Hockey: A Narrative Perspective

During adolescence, there is an increased need for interaction with peers as adolescents struggle to form their personal identity, and their social realm expands beyond the family to peer groups (Wagner, 1996). Sport teams provide a salient context for youth to establish their identities. Youth are drawn to sport teams as the environment provides opportunities for interpersonal interaction and the fulfillment of a psychological need for belonging (Allen, 2003; Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Participation rates in youth sport – particularly in team settings (Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute, 2009; United States Census Bureau, 2012) – as well as previous research (e.g., Bruner, Eys, Wilson & Côté, 2014; Holt, Black, Tammimen, Fox, & Mandigo, 2008; Smith, 2007), highlight the potential importance of sport to the personal and social development of youth.

An important component of an adolescents' self-concept is the identities they form through their membership in groups, often referred to as their social identities. Social identity has been defined as "that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his/her knowledge of his/her membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (Tajfel, 1981, p. 255). Social Identity Theory (SIT; Tafjel & Turner, 1979) explains the mechanisms through which people align with being a member of particular social groups (e.g., high school football team) as well as the personal and collective outcomes that derive from identification with social groups (e.g., performance; Bruner, Dunlop & Beauchamp, 2014). A key facet of SIT is that people define and evaluate themselves in terms of the social groups to which they perceive they belong (Hogg & Abrams, 2001).

Early experimental research conducted by Tajfel and colleagues (1971) revealed that group membership, even on the basis of trivial criteria (e.g., coin flip), can substantially shape patterns of individual behavior toward others. More specifically, participants randomized to groups based upon arbitrary criteria (referred to as minimal group paradigm) tended to rate members of their own group (ingroup) more favorably than members of other groups (outgroup) and demonstrated behavioral bias toward ingroup members (Tafel, Billing, Bundy, & Flament, 1971). Laboratory and field research over the past 40 years support Tajfel and Turner's early work (e.g., Nezlek & Smith, 2005) and suggest that group identification has important consequences for social identity and moral behavior (Hornsey, 2008). Researchers in organizational and social psychology have examined social identity and moral behavior in a number of contexts including business (e.g., non-profit organizations, Tidwell, 2005), political sectarian violence (e.g., youth aggressive and delinquent behaviors, Merrilees, Goeke-Morey Cairns, Taylor, Shirlow, Cummings, 2013), and gang violence (e.g., Goldman, Giles, Hogg, 2014). As an organizational example, Tidwell (2005) found that volunteers who identified more strongly with their non-profit organization (i.e., increased social identity) reported more frequent prosocial behaviors. Given the apparent importance of social identity for moral behavior in non-sport contexts, and the prominence of moral behavior in sport (e.g., Shields, Bredemeier, Lavoi, & Power, 2007), research is needed that aids our understanding of the effects of social identity on moral behavior in sport.

Moral behavior in sport can be defined as a broad range of intentional acts that can result in positive or negative consequences for others (Kavussanu & Boardley, 2012). Moral behavior is frequently subdivided into prosocial and antisocial behaviors, with the former defined as voluntary acts intended to help or benefit another individual or group of individuals (Eisenberg

& Fabes, 1998), and the latter as voluntary acts intended to harm or disadvantage another individual or group of individuals (Sage, Kavussanu, & Duda, 2006). Clearly, both of these behavior types have relevance to youth moral development. Importantly, individuals who identify strongly with their group have been found to behave more positively with group members than non-group members (Nezlek & Smith, 2005) and display more prosocial behavior toward group members and antisocial behavior toward outgroup members (Hornstein, 1976). However, sport-specific work on social identity has been quite limited to date, with only two studies investigating the relationship between social identity and sport team performance (Murrell & Gaertner, 1992; Zucchermaglio, 2005), and just two studying the association between social identity and moral behavior (Bruner, Boardley, Allan, Root, Buckham, Forrest & Côté., 2016; Bruner, Boardley, & Côté, 2014).

Bruner and colleagues (2014) investigated the relationship between social identity and moral behavior in youth sport. This initial work prospectively examined how social identity was related to prosocial and antisocial behaviors toward teammates and opponents in 329 high school athletes from 26 teams in a range of sports. The effects of three dimensions of social identity on moral behaviors were examined through structural equation modeling, including: (a) ingroup ties – perceptions of similarity, bonding, and belongingess with the group; (b) cognitive centrality – the importance of being a group member; and (c) ingroup affect – positive feelings associated with group membership (Cameron, 2004). However, the cognitive centrality dimension was excluded from the analysis due to poor reliability. Overall, results indicated that adolescents who held greater perceptions of ingroup affect at the beginning of the season reported engaging in more prosocial behaviors toward teammates at the end of the season (Bruner, Boardley et al., 2014). In addition, perceptions of ingroup ties at the beginning of the season were associated

with increased frequency of prosocial behavior toward teammates and decreased antisocial behavior towards teammates (mediated by changes in cohesion) (Bruner, Boardley et al., 2014). These findings highlight the potentially salient impact that social identity may have on moral behavior in youth sport settings particularly in terms of regulating moral behavior toward team members (i.e., intrateam behavior).

In addition to this initial quantitative research, a recent qualitative study has examined social identity and moral behavior in youth-sport participants using stimulated recall interviews (Bruner et al., 2016). Amongst other findings, this study identified possible reciprocal relationships between social identity and moral behavior in sport. However, to further understand the interrelations between social identity and moral behavior in sport, additional research using alternative qualitative approaches is needed. To this end, the current research employed a narrative enquiry approach. Narrative inquiry can be described as a tradition of qualitative research that views participants as storytellers (Smith, 2010). More specifically, narrative inquiry uses the stories participants tell as the primary source of data, and is appropriate for determining meaning and aiding understanding of life experiences (Smith, 2010; Sparkes & Smith, 2014). As such, the overarching purpose of this study was to better understand the interactions between social identity and moral behavior through the stories of competitive youth ice hockey players.

Narrative inquiry has been successfully utilized in sport to understand a broad range of topics including adolescent views of masculinity in sport (Naess, 2001), youth sport coaches' learning situations (Lemyre, Trudel & Durand-Bush, 2007), and athletic identity after acquiring a physical disability (Perrier, Smith, Strachan & Latimer-Cheung, 2014). A common technique to elicit participants' stories is through interviewing. As such, through interviews, participants in the present study were actively encouraged to share not simply reports of events, but their

personal stories surrounding these events (Smith, 2010). Using a thematic narrative approach, this study aimed to address the following questions: First, what are the dominant narratives of social identity (ingroup ties, cognitive centrality, ingroup affect) constructed by youth ice hockey players? Second, how do narratives of social identity influence intrateam moral behaviors in the youth ice hockey context? Third and finally, provided that youth sport coaches are known to play an important role in athlete development (Camiré, Trudel, & Forneris, 2014), how (if at all) do youth ice hockey coaches contribute to the construction of their athletes' social identity-moral behavior narratives?

These questions were explored within the context of competitive youth ice hockey for two main reasons. To begin, ice hockey is a very popular youth sport in North America where the research took place; approximately 600,000 youth were registered for hockey in Canada at the time of data collection (Ontario Hockey Federation, 2013), with approximately 350, 000 further youth participants registered with the USA National Hockey Organization (USA Hockey National, 2014). Furthermore, ice hockey is an interactive team sport that provides frequent situations that involve moral dilemmas with the potential to lead to both positive and negative behaviours (Shields, Bredemeier, Lavoi, & Power, 2007). As such, this sport appeared to represent an ideal context in which to pursue the study aims.

Method

Theoretical Orientation and Methodology

A social constructivist orientation guided the research investigating youth perceptions of social identity and moral behaviour. A relativist ontology and subjectivist epistemology was adopted conceiving that reality is socially constructed and multifaceted involving multiple subjective realities (Sparkes & Smith, 2014). In undertaking this approach, we acknowledged that the mind plays an important role in constructing reality through contextual meanings and

interpretations and that knowledge is co-created by the interaction of participant and researcher (Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Sparkes & Smith, 2014). Drawing on elements of narrative inquiry (Smith, 2010, Sparkes & Smith, 2014), we aimed to use the stories of the participants to increase our understanding of social identity and moral behaviour in competitive youth hockey.

Participants

The sample included 36 competitive youth ice hockey players from nine Northern Ontario teams.[1] Participants were purposively sampled to include four individuals from each team; each team member potentially having a unique perspective based on a particular characteristic relating to their team membership. Participants were identified by the following characteristics: team captain, verbal cheerleader, social captain and most aggressive player. Head coaches were asked to identify these four players in the team they coach using definitions for each characteristic. Team captains were defined as the team member who is the formal leader or team captain, verbal cheerleaders as the team member who encourages and cheers teammates on, social captains as the team member who organizes team and social events, and most aggressive players as the team member who is the most aggressive (e.g., playing a rough game, committing penalties) during competition. Athletes were identified in this way to maximize the variability of sport experiences and expressions of identities represented in the sample. None of the athletes identified by the coaches played a dual role; therefore, four athletes from each of nine teams provided a total sample of 36 participants. Twenty-four participants were male, and participants'

[1]The teams involved in this study were part of a large mixed-method project examining social identity and moral behavior in youth sport which also incorporates another recent qualitative study (i.e., Bruner et al., 2016). Although six of the nine teams recruited for the current study were also used for recruitment in the work of Bruner et al. (2016), no participants were common to both studies.

ages ranged from 11 to 17 years of age (*M* age = 12.4, *SD* =1.7). The teams these players represented participated at peewee (11-12 years of age; *n* =20), bantam (13-14 years of age; *n* =12) or midget (15-17 years of age; *n* =4) level.

Data Collection

Prior to the start of the current investigation, ethical consent from the university of the first author and the three participating hockey associations was obtained. In addition, all athletes, and parents of the athletes, provided written consent. Participants who were identified by their head coach as the team captain, verbal cheerleader, social captain and most aggressive player participated in narrative interviews near the end of the regular season. Narrative interviews used a semi-structured open-ended format, which is similar in style to an ordinary conversation with the interviewees doing most of the talking (Patton, 2002). This procedure allowed the interviewer to focus the topic of discussion but allowed the interviewees the freedom to answer openly without restrictions. The research team, which included the first author and five trained research assistants, conducted interviews individually and often simultaneously in sessions before or after practices. The five trained research assistants were fourth-year undergraduate students and a research coordinator. All were familiar with the interview guide and aims of the research. With expertise regarding social identity and moral behavior in youth sport contexts, the first and second authors oversaw the training of interviewers and data analysis process to ensure the constructs of interest were appropriately considered. Multiple interviewers were necessary as there were instances when two sets of athletes from two teams were interviewed simultaneously. Each narrative interview lasted between 15 and 35 minutes (*M* = 24.21 minutes) and took place at a mutually agreed upon time and location (e.g., after hockey practice at the ice hockey rink).

A three-section interview guide, as outlined by Mayan (2009), was created specifically for the current study. The first section of the interview guide contained opening questions that allowed the researchers to collect demographic information from the participant (e.g., how long have you been participating in competitive hockey?). To address our first and second research questions, the second section encompassed questions pertaining to the dimensions of social identity, including in-group ties (e.g., do you feel you have a lot in common with other members on this team?), cognitive centrality (e.g., how important is being part of this team to how you view yourself as a person?) and in-group affect (e.g., in general, describe the feelings and emotions that you associate with being a member of the team?), in addition to moral behavior (e.g., "How do team members normally treat each other in practice?"). Aligning with our third and final research question, the third section contained questions that asked participants about strategies their coaches and team members use to foster a sense of social identity, as well as strategies used to foster prosocial team member behavior and dissuade or deter antisocial team member behavior. Interested readers can contact the lead author if they would like a copy of the interview guide.

The narrative interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. A research assistant verified each transcript by playing the audiotape of each interview in its entirety and following along with the transcript. This procedure helped to highlight and correct any errors in the initial transcription. Identifying and personal information were removed from the transcripts to ensure participant anonymity.

Data Analysis

A thematic narrative analysis was conducted to highlight key themes within the narratives expressed by participants (Reissman, 2008). Specifically, interview transcripts were analyzed to

identify the stories participants told about their respective teams to represent, convey or express their social identities and interactions with teammates. This analysis allowed us to identify narrative themes concerning *what* participants were saying about their social identities and moral behavior (e.g., Leiblich et al., 1998), thus allowing us to identify and understand participants' social identities and how these may influence their moral behavior towards teammates (Smith & Sparkes, 2012). As recommended, prior theory in this study, social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981) and social cognitive theory (SCT; Bandura, 1991; 1999) served as a resource for interpretation of the narratives (Riessman, 2008). Despite using theory for guidance in the interpretation of the narratives, a qualitative approach still allows for unanticipated phenomena to emerge and to be investigated during the interviews, that allows new themes and ideas to be generated from the analysis (Perrier et al., 2014).

Highlighting and coding of the transcripts was done using Nvivo computer software, with complete responses to a question being coded to prevent potential loss of content that could have occurred if individual sentences had been coded (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) and to ensure that stories told by participants in response to specific questions remained intact (Smith, 2015). Participant coding incorporates information on team number (i.e., Team #1-9), level of participation (i.e., Peewee = PW, Bantam = BTM, Midget = MGT), identifying characteristic (i.e., team captain = TC, verbal cheerleader = VC, social captain = SC and most aggressive player = MA), and participant number (e.g., Team #2, PW, TC, P3 = Team #2, Peewee level, Team Captain, Participant #3). When required, square brackets (i.e., [ ]) have been used to add additional words to clarify quotes.

Quality of the Research

Consistent with constructivism, we developed a flexible list of criteria to be used as an evaluative tool for our research (Smith & Deemer, 2000; Sparkes & Smith, 2014). Building from the four criteria proposed by Lieblich and colleagues (1998) and utilized by Perrier and colleagues (2014) to evaluate narrative research (i.e., width, coherence, insightfulness, and parsimony), we have also added theoretical generalization and reflexivity to our list of evaluative criteria.

To achieve width, or comprehensiveness of the evidence, numerous quotations were reported throughout the narratives to empower readers with the autonomy to evaluate the evidence and our interpretation (Lieblich et al., 1998). Alternatively, coherence encompassed the construction of a meaningful picture of participants' lives. Similar to the work of Perrier and colleagues (2014), theory was incorporated into the interviews and analysis to provide a meaningful framework against which to understand the participant's storied experiences. Insightfulness refers to greater comprehension and novel insight into both the narratives presented and the readers' own lives (Lieblich et al. 1998). While previous studies have examined social identity and moral behavior in sport, this study is the first to explore youth perceptions of this relationship. Readers may also find that these narratives resonate with their own experiences (i.e., naturalistic generalization; Stake, 1982). Additionally, by exploring the relationship between theoretical concepts such as social identity and moral behavior in competitive youth ice hockey, the resulting narratives provide a coherent means for readers to understand the experiences of the participants and the related theory – thus contributing to parsimony. As a result, these findings may inform theoretical generalizations; that is, generalizations to theory that help us to explain an empirically derived association or relationship (see Sharp, 1998).

In addition to these criteria, the third author acted as a "critical friend" to ensure reflexivity was achieved throughout the research process. As recommended by Smith and Sparkes (2012), a critical friend encourages reflection and exploration of alternative interpretations of the data, which may also contribute to width. This process is useful as researchers can challenge and develop interpretations that enable the construction of a coherent and theoretically sound argument to defend the case (Smith & Deemer, 2000; Smith & Sparkes, 2012). Finally, due to the presence of multiple interviewers (n = 6) and coders (n = 2) throughout the research process, comparisons of coding labels were made throughout the analysis. Aligning with our theoretical positioning and the assumptions underpinning narrative inquiry, we acknowledge that there is no singular, objective truth to be 'discovered' and accept differences in the judgments and power relations present among coders of varying status. However, to ensure a primary focus on our research questions and constructs of interests, these checks allowed the most experienced researchers to explore and understand the interpretations of the interviewers and coders relative to the aims of the study.

Results

The stories told by the athletes were developed into three key narratives: Family-oriented, performance-oriented, and dominance-oriented (see Table 1). Throughout the data analysis it was apparent that all four members of each team were in general agreement concerning the environment within their team, and as such consistently used similar terms to describe the social identity and moral behaviors of their team (see Riessman, 2008). Correspondingly, the narratives presented did not appear to be unique to individual athletes, but rather represented the environment and behavioural patterns present at the team level.

Family-Oriented Narrative

Participants on all three female teams (2 Peewee, 1 Bantam) and three of the six male teams (2 Peewee, 1 Bantam) expressed their experiences within a moral team environment characterized by frequent prosocial and infrequent antisocial behavior among teammates. A key focus was on supporting rather than criticizing team members by offering encouragement and constructive feedback. Evidence of this theme was illustrated by one female athlete: "*You try not to put anybody down and try to bring them back up and give them confidence, just say 'we'll get it next time'. Like when they make a bad pass you don't go off the ice and give them crap for that. You just say, 'keep your eyes open and stuff and always look around'* " (Team #5, FPW, VC, P20). As another example, a male athlete expressed, "*We don't bring anybody down because of a bad play. Everybody tries to keep up the other players, and keep them in the game, don't let 'em go and put their heads down, keep it up"* (Team #8, MPW, MA, P30).

Athletes articulated the importance of emotional control and regulation in preventing antisocial behavior towards teammates during competition, such as verbal abuse and criticism following a teammate's mistake. For example, one athlete stated, "*You get frustrated sometimes but you're not going to yell at the guy and get mad at him and tell him"* (Team #7, BTM, VC, P28). Similar self-regulation of moral behavior was evident in another player's comment: *"[You get] fired up at your teammates because everyone does [make] mistakes. And just try and let it roll off your back*" (Team #7, BTM, SC, P27).

Strong perceptions of the three dimensions of social identity (i.e., ingroup ties, cognitive centrality, and ingroup affect) were evident within this narrative. Several athletes highlighted the central role of the team in representing their identities, indicating a high degree of cognitive centrality. As an example, a female athlete stated, "*I think it's really important [being on the team] 'cause that's how I say who I am*" (Team #1, BTM, VC, P04). Two male teammates

described a similar sentiment, as demonstrated by the following quotes: "*They [the team] are a part of me, we stand for each other*" (Team #1, BTM, SC, P03) and "*…you are an Ice Bolt, and that represents you*." (Team #1, BTM, TC, P01). Players on male and female teams aligning with a family-oriented narrative expressed strong positive feelings toward their teams, as highlighted by one male participant: "*I get that tingly feeling. It's just like this big rush. I have a really great hockey team, great coaches, it's just a great feeling all together*" (Team #8, PW, VC, P32). A similar positive feeling was shared by a female participant who said, "*Sometimes you get people at school that ask me 'do you play hockey?' And it's like, 'ya I do.' It just makes me feel proud that I'm able to say I'm apart of [the] Peewee A Ice Bolts*" (Team #2, FPW, MA, P06). This strong sense of ingroup affect was echoed by a male minor peewee athlete in saying, "*I am really proud of being on this team*" (Team #8, PW, MA, P30).

Athletes on family-oriented teams also described strong ingroup ties (i.e., tight bonds and closeness of the team). Athletes on these teams felt strong ingroup ties were analogous to that of a tight knit family, and attributed these bonds to the frequent prosocial and infrequent antisocial intrateam behavior they perceived. This familial analogy was highlighted by a male athlete: *" I think of this [team] as a family…so if any of us are in trouble we will always take their side … we're not going to go against them"* (Team #7, BTM, VC, P28). Another example of this strong sense of family was expressed by a female peewee player who explained, "*Because our team is like a family…we are really loud and cheer each other on and like congratulate each other when we do good shifts and stuff like that"* (Team #2, PW, VC, P08). The importance of displaying respect toward team members was grounded in a strong and shared sense of social identity, which was commonly identified by both female and male athletes.

For example, intolerance toward antisocial teammate behavior was explained as a function of strong ingroup ties. As highlighted by one female peewee athlete:

> *We are very respectful to each other because we are like family. So it's very rude if you disrespect them because they are just like your best friends, and it is disappointing if someone is disrespectful to you because it's like pretty much your parents or your family or your cousins, brothers, or sisters are stabbing you in the back. So we are always respectful towards each other*. (Team #2, PW, VC, P08).

This strong sense of ingroup ties was further demonstrated by one athlete's willingness to step up for any athlete on the team. He stated, "*We'll step up for each other if we see some other team trying to get us down we'll like back them up. So we're very unique, most of us will step in like 'I don't care who you are if you're on my team I'll step up for you and defend you'* " (Team #5, PW, MA, P18).

An inclusive atmosphere was clear among teams in the family-oriented narrative, as exemplified in the following quote: "*In the dressing room some people sit beside the same person every time, so we have been moving around more so you are beside someone new every time. There are a couple of really shy girls on the team so we sit with them and just talk it up and see how their day was*" (Team #1, BTM, VC, P04). The inclusive environment appeared to foster ingroup ties and social cohesion, as well as dissuading antisocial behavior among teammates. For example, one athlete stated, "*I find that our team really bonds together, everybody gets along with each other. So there is not one person that's left out... and there is not rudeness or gossip in our team*" (Team #3, PW, MA, P10). Family-oriented team athletes also described task cohesion in their respective team environments, as evidenced by the following

quote: "*I think everybody is on the same page. Everyone is trying to do the right thing for the team*" (Team #8, PW, MA, P30).

The coach was consistently identified as a key character in the family-oriented team narrative. More specifically, athletes on family-oriented teams described their coaches as playing a critical role in building a strong team identity, promoting prosocial teammate behavior and deterring antisocial team behavior. Within the athletes' storied experiences, coaches promoted an inclusive team atmosphere by encouraging interactions with different athletes on the team during practice (e.g., different partners for drills), and organizing team events (e.g., fundraisers, team dinners) off the ice in an effort to bring the team together. As one athlete explained, "*We've had a couple of players especially this year who came from out of town and they are new on the team this year. My dad is one of the coaches so he says like just try and talk to her in the dressing room if a couple of girls on the team start talking to them…you would be surprised at how progressive they are like talking now"* (Team #1, SC, P03). Team members also discussed inappropriate intrateam behavior as an important topic of team meetings, particularly with respect to coaches' intolerance of antisocial behavior. One athlete recalled, "*If he [the coach] catches you being mean or treating someone bad you can be sitting a game or period*" (Team #5, PW, SC, P8). Another athlete stated, "*Well he [coach] says "we're a team and to act like a team. You have to respect your team"* (Team #3, PW, MA, P10). Notably, athletes on family-oriented teams also described the important role of teammates in policing intrateam antisocial behavior.

Performance-Oriented Narrative

For one team (male midget), the interpreted narrative appeared to be conflicted with respect to patterns of moral behavior among teammates, such that participants on this team

observed high levels of prosocial *and* antisocial behavior that was contingent upon the team's performance or success. The four athletes on this team described a supportive and inclusive team environment in which team members engaged in frequent prosocial behavior with their peers. For example, one athlete said, "*Everyone is well natured to each other on and off the ice…You're a friend with everyone on the team no matter what, no matter where you are"* (Team #4, MGT, VC, P16). Another athlete explained, "*We always treat each other with respect and most of the time this year we've done that and if it's not happening its being addressed by leaders on the team*" (Team #4, MGT, TC, P13).

In contrast, athletes on the performance-oriented team also described frequent antisocial behavior toward teammates. These behaviors often appeared to be a function of personal performance expectations that were not met. For example: "*Some of the guys that expect a lot out of themselves and they don't get that, sometimes start to point fingers at the people around them*." (Team #4, MGT, VC, P16). In other instances, the intrateam antisocial behavior appeared to be a function of team members' 'self-policing' or criticizing a team member for not putting forth enough effort in practices or games. As one midget team member stated, "*It's frustrating because the people who do take it seriously and focus and it impedes them if someone else is slacking off, it frustrates other people for sure*" (Team#4, MGT, TC, P13). Issues with a perceived lack of effort or seriousness among team members and the resulting implications of these perceptions on intrateam behavior was certainly highlighted by the athletes: "*It's a piss-off when the guys coming down to shoot and he's dogging it and you can tell. That's not pleasant for the rest of the players, and it's not fair because you're - we're trying to compete and we are trying to get better and we got guys doggin' it, you know, it's bad for us"* (Team #4, MGT, SC, P15). Imbalance among team members with respect to performance expectations, motivation and

seriousness appears to contribute to intrateam antisocial behavior in the performance-oriented team narrative.

Within this narrative, there was some evidence of the three dimensions of social identity. One midget athlete recalled thinking about the team throughout the day, indicating cognitive centrality: "*Besides school and family, it's at the rink here with these guys so it's a pretty big part of my life*" (Team #4, MGT, VC, P16). Athletes also expressed positive ingroup affect, evidenced by a sense of pride and happiness when thinking about the team. For example, one athlete stated, "*It makes me proud to wear a Trappers coat*" (Team #4, MGT, VC, P16). Finally, players highlighted their closeness as a team (i.e., ingroup ties), as demonstrated by this athlete: "*The whole winning together and losing together is a big aspect. Hockey is a team sport and win together and you lose together and that makes it ten times better than if you're alone. These guys you're with them all of the time and you get so tight that it makes it that much better when you win*" (Team #4, MGT, SC, P15).

While their perceptions of social identity were modest and not as strong as reported in the family-oriented teams, athletes in the performance-oriented team narrative described a relatively high degree of task and social cohesion within the stories they told: *"We all work together. We have great leadership on our team. We are comfortable with each other. We all have a good time. No one feels left out. It's a very combined group of good guys"* (Team #4, MGT, VC, P16). These strong perceptions of cohesion appeared to foster a sense of comfort with all the players at the rink and beyond, as exemplified in this quote: "*We are all super close we can have any kind of conversation we want, both in the dressing room and out of the dressing room, at tournaments and stuff like that. You can go into anyone's room and not feel that you're intruding at all"* (Team #4, MGT, TC, P13). The friendships cultivated at the rink in the inclusive, cohesive

setting described by these athletes naturally developed and carried over to the world outside of hockey with little direction from adult figures (e.g., coaches). As one athlete explains, "*No one tells us that outside of hockey we have to be friends or anything. It just happens that way. A lot of people we just grow naturally those bonds*" (Team #4, MGT, TC, P13). Finally, players demonstrated an understanding of the importance of spending time together away from the rink as a means of strengthening ingroup ties and social cohesion. To demonstrate, one athlete stated, "[We] *get together after a hockey game or on weekends when we don't have games and just hang out and it helps, it gets [the] team bonding stronger*" (Team #4, MGT, TC, P13).

Finally, athletes on the performance-oriented team described a clear understanding of how intrateam behavior impacted social identity. Specifically, the athletes understood the detrimental influence of antisocial behavior toward teammates. As an example, one athlete described how antisocial behavior might impact ingroup affect by stating, "*We're not going to be a team that'll pick on one kid and the one kid only, and make him feel like shit you know. We're going to make sure everybody feels good about themselves and feels good about this team*." (Team #4, MGT, SC, P15). Interestingly, athletes in the performance-oriented team narrative did not discuss or demonstrate an awareness of how prosocial behavior impacted teammates social identity.

Once again, the athletes on the performance-oriented team identified their coach as a key character in the narrative. By encouraging supportive comments toward team members, organizing team activities (e.g., a secret Santa game to exchange Christmas gifts, a trip to a large arcade), and ensuring everyone stayed together at team functions (e.g., sitting together rather than at separate tables during team dinners), the coach functioned to promote social identity, cohesion, and adaptive moral behavior. To exemplify the coaches' role, one athlete explained

that "*Coaches are always doing something, like on the bus, everybody is sitting together, everybody's you know talking to each other, on road trips in the hotel everybody's rooming with someone different*" (Team #4, MGT, SC, P15). Another teammate discussed how the team activities organized by the coach influence the inclusive environment of the team, stating: "*Team functions and including everyone in it and it's not just a select few, it's the entire team. Everyone does it together so it makes everyone feel welcome and part of the team*" (Team #4, MGT, TC, P13). Thus, the efforts by the coach to promote cohesion and prosocial intrateam behavior appeared to have strengthened team identity.

Other important characters in the performance-oriented team narrative included team leaders, who also functioned to promote an inclusive team environment. One participant captured the importance of team leaders when he said, "*Just making sure everyone's involved that's the biggest thing. You can wear all the stuff that you want to look like a team but really to be a team, you need to act like a team and that starts from the guys that are in charge of the team….so they [teammates] look to the leaders on our team and we do the best that we can to make it a team environment."*(Team #4, MGT, VC, P16).

Dominance-Oriented Narrative

Two male teams (one peewee, one bantam[2]) were interpreted to be within a dominance-oriented team narrative that reflected a negative team environment. Prosocial behaviors toward teammates were infrequently referenced, while stories of intrateam antisocial behavior were regularly expressed and at times quite malicious. Athletes on these teams described frequent

[2]The bantam boys team included one female player. She was only explicitly mentioned twice by the team captain during the interviews, and was not perceived to have any particular influence – positive or negative – on the variables and relationships of interest in this study.

antisocial behavior towards teammates, physical and verbal in nature. Negative verbal comments were reported during competition, practice, and in the locker room. One bantam athlete highlighted constant antisocial verbal comments toward team members when he claimed, "*We start yelling at each other, and giving each other crap about what they are doing wrong*" (Team #6, BTM, SC, P23). Another athletes stated, "*If we lose maybe it's somebody's fault. Usually there's those couple of people who always get frustrated and they really yell at the other people***"** (Team #9, PW, MA, P34). Verbal comments were not only directed at players but also uttered behind the athlete's backs, as evidenced in the following quote: "*I know some guys aren't really nice to each other so they're saying nasty stuff behind their backs (*Team #9, PW, MA, P34*).*

Lack of respect for team members and the team as a whole was evident throughout the dominance-oriented team narrative, as demonstrated by the physical and verbal antisocial behavior toward teammates. One player lamented, "*We've had a couple of issues with players not getting along and injuring other players, trying to hit them hard in practice*" (Team #6, BTM, VC, P24). This player was referring to a series of overt, physical antisocial behaviours towards teammates that occurred during a practice in which players intentionally tried to injure their teammates. The captain was identified as one of the players who hit and concussed a teammate; as a player in a position of leadership, this behavior may have had a profound influence on the presence of antisocial behaviors among the team. The captain may be using his position of power to assert dominance over his teammates, which may promote similar aggressive behavior among the team. In another instance, a player who deliberately injured a teammate was isolated from the team in an effort to display the unacceptability of his actions toward a team member. One athlete recalled, "*Some of us didn't talk to him for a while, some of us just tried to ignore him, but he apologized to the team and then we all got back together*."

(Team#6, BTM, VC, P24). The negative team environment prompted another player to leave the team midseason.

On another team, athletes described similar physical altercations and conflicts among teammates. According to one of these players, "*There has actually been a couple of scraps on the ice in practice*." (Team #9, PW, P34). Another team member discussed the ongoing 'chirping' and nitpicking toward teammates: "*We just chirp each other all the time...doesn't show much respect on the team*" (Team #9, PW, SC, P35). In addition to physical and verbal comments, cyber bullying was also identified. In the words of one athlete, *"There's some people who, bully each other, like because they don't want to say it in person. They think they can get away with it...Just like messages, text messages*" (Team #9, PW, MA, P34). Provided that bullying behavior is defined as repetitive, aggressive behavior characterized by an imbalance of power (Olweus, 1999), bullying tactics are reflective of the dominance narrative such that the bully is attempting to establish dominance over a fellow teammate. Collectively, members of the two teams highlighted the lack of respect characterized by the frequent intrateam antisocial behavior. For example: "*Making fun of each other, treating each other not like a teammate and pointing each other out*" (Team #9, PW, MA, P34).

Negative intrateam behavior appeared to have a profound impact on the sense of social identity among teams in the dominance-oriented narrative, particularly with respect to perceptions of ingroup affect. This effect was captured in the following quotation: "*I was pretty frustrated about the whole team thing…there was just a lot of negative things…say someone made a mistake and you would hop on the guy and just start being negative*" (Team #6, BTM, MA, P22). The highlighted example also exemplified the individualistic, dominance-focused nature of the behavior; specifically, blaming other athletes as scapegoats for the team's failure

with no regard for self-implication. Interestingly, the treatment of teammates also appeared to vary based on the team's performance. As one athlete stated, "*It depends on if we are doing well or not. If we are doing really well we treat each other really well. If we're doing poorly it's hectic on the bench. Like it's really negative always talking back to each other, talking back to the coaches*" (Team #6, BTM, VC, P24).

Among athletes belonging to the dominance-oriented team narrative, some avoided team functions and did not work hard in practice. One athlete explained, "*Some of us didn't come to the team meetings or team meals or stuff like that…we just weren't bonding enough*" (Team #6, BTM, VC, P24). These decisions and behaviors indicated low levels of task and social cohesion among dominance-oriented teams. Nonetheless, some athletes also described the importance of working together. In the words of one athlete, "*You need to be getting along on the team or else the team's not going to work*" (Team, #9, PW, MA, P34). Despite the presence of this sentiment, few athletes in the dominance-oriented team narrative appeared to exhibit these behaviors.

As characters in the dominance-oriented narrative, athletes described coaches as contributors to the management of intrateam behavior. However, the stories told by participants indicate that the majority of coaching behavior directed toward intrateam behavior on these two teams was reactionary. On one team, the coach responded to athletes goofing around in the dressing room by bringing in a parent changing room monitor. As one athlete explained, "*Goofing off in the dressing room that's probably one of our biggest problems because we actually have to have a room monitor in our changing room because people aren't getting along and then you have to have people in there to, like, control us, really*" (Team #9, PW, MA, P34). On the second team, the coaches were nearly removed from the team by intervening parents who perceived a lack of action toward antisocial intrateam behavior on the coaches' part. The players

discussed this critical point in the season and how they attempted to reverse the negativity associated with their team environment. One athlete recalls this call to action: "*We almost got our coaches fired because of that (negative intrateam behavior) so we (the players) had to make a change*" (Team #6, BTM, VC, P24).

Discussion

The current study aimed to better understand social identity by examining how it may influence intrateam moral behavior specifically in competitive youth ice hockey. Three narratives were interpreted within the data: family-oriented, performance-oriented, and dominance-oriented team narratives. The family-oriented narrative was characterized by strong social identities, a cohesive environment, and engagement in relatively high and low amounts of prosocial and antisocial behavior directed towards teammates, respectively. Alternatively, the performance-oriented narrative revealed a modest degree of social identity and engagement in both prosocial and antisocial intrateam behavior contingent upon team outcomes and performance. Finally, the dominance-oriented team narrative reflected a team environment weak in social identity with regular occurrences of physical and verbal antisocial intrateam behaviour, and infrequently referenced accounts of prosocial behavior towards teammates.

In discussing the present findings, it is instructive to contrast the three narratives and consider the findings in relation to extant literature in sport and other settings. To begin, the performance-oriented team narrative shared some of the traits of the family-oriented team narrative; however, teams aligning with the family-oriented narrative demonstrated stronger perceptions of social identity and fewer accounts of intrateam antisocial behavior. These findings align with previous qualitative research in which student-athletes who demonstrated greater affiliation with their high school sport team described their respective teams like a family (Ennis,

Solman, Satina, Loftus, Mensch, & McCuley, 1999). Similar to a family environment and our study findings, the student-athletes felt responsible to their teams and showed respect to their team members. The investigation by Ennis and colleagues (1999) revealed that the sense of family experienced by the youth was conducive to youth engagement and participation, which indicates that the family-oriented narrative may have important implications for the family-oriented narrative in youth sport settings.

Alternatively, the performance-oriented and dominance-oriented team narratives shared commonality with respect to the prevalence of intrateam antisocial behavior expressed within the athletes' stories. Interestingly, these narratives differed in terms of the motivations that underpinned such behavior, as well as in the actual behaviors discussed by the athletes. In the performance-oriented team narrative, the antisocial behavior described by athletes was motivated by players attempting to self-police their teammates' behavior, whereas the antisocial behavior described in the dominance-oriented team narrative appeared to be driven by aggression towards teammates. Furthermore, antisocial behavior in the performance-oriented narrative was primarily verbal in nature, whereas similar behaviors in the dominance-oriented narrative frequently included physical acts such as attempting to injure a teammate. The greater reported frequency of physical and verbal antisocial behaviour toward teammates – in particular, the aggressive behavior present in the dominance-oriented narrative – is consistent with a masculine narrative, in which traditionally masculine traits such as strength, competition, and aggression are dominant (Rhode, 1997).

A particularly noteworthy finding was the apparent bidirectional relationship between social identity and intrateam moral behavior. Previous research in sport (Bruner, Boardley, et al., 2014) and other settings (e.g., business; Tidwell, 2005; society; Van Der Vegt, Emans & Van

De Vliert, 2000) has shown identity with a group can prospectively predict intragroup moral behavior (e.g., greater cooperation, helping, personal constraint; Van Der Vegt et al., 2000). Support for this finding was demonstrated in the family-oriented narrative wherein strong feelings toward the team – analogous to that of a family – were described as key mechanisms leading to respect and prosocial action among teammates. This finding is consistent with a multi-level review on prosocial behavior that highlighted the influential role group membership may play on behavior toward ingroup members (Penner et al. 2005).

Nonetheless, athletes across all three narratives also described how they felt intrateam moral behavior influenced social identity – thus indicating that the reverse relationship may also be true. In the family-oriented narrative, athletes consistently depicted situations through which prosocial teammate behavior appeared to influence social identity. Athletes highlighted the importance of being encouraging and inclusive with all team members to foster a strong team and family atmosphere. In further support of the moral behavior-social identity link, athletes on the performance-oriented and dominance-oriented teams commented on the negative impact of antisocial teammate behavior on social identity.

Support to substantiate this possible bidirectional relationship between moral behavior and social identity can be drawn from recent research in sport (Bruner et al., 2016), as well as the extant social and organizational psychology literature (Goldman, Giles, & Hogg, 2014; Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005). First, Bruner and colleagues found that youth-sport participants uniformly reported how prosocial interactions with teammates enhanced their social identity. However, the perceived influence of antisocial teammate behavior on social identity differed depending on athletes' reported frequency of antisocial behavior toward teammates. Specifically, whereas athletes reporting low and moderate frequency of antisocial teammate

behaviour felt such behaviour undermined social identity, athletes who reported high frequency of antisocial teammate perceived no such effect. Regarding research outside sport, in Penner and colleagues' (2005) review of prosocial behavior, the authors emphasize the complexity of prosocial behavior while highlighting the lack of attention paid toward the possible consequences of prosocial behaviour on individual's attitudes, values and identities. Additional support for the moral behavior-social identity relationship can be drawn from research examining antisocial behavior such as violence (e.g., drive-by shootings) in youth gangs. Goldman and colleagues (2014) revealed increased perceptions of status, self-esteem and social identity in the group particularly among new gang members from violent and aggressive behaviors toward others. Collectively, the qualitative accounts presented here and previous research in sport and broader social contexts suggests there could be bidirectional effects between social identity and moral behavior.

Another interesting observation across all three narratives was the emphasis placed on the importance of social identity with respect to the relationship between performance and intrateam moral behavior. Within all three narratives, poor performance was identified as a potential catalyst for detrimental intrateam moral behavior. The focus on performance in a competitive setting is not surprising as a performance narrative has been identified as a central narrative in the elite sport context (e.g., Douglas & Caless, 2006). Even more troubling is an increasing focus on and prioritization of performance above all other values in youth sport programs and sport culture (e.g., Ingham, Chure & Butt, 2002). Of interest within this study was the finding that differences in social identity between narratives appeared to determine whether a disappointing performance ultimately led to antisocial intrateam behavior. More specifically, poor performances appeared to initiate antisocial intrateam behaviour when social identity was low or

moderate (i.e., in the performance-oriented and dominance-oriented team narratives); alternatively, no effect was evident when social identity was high, suggesting a strong sense of team identity may act as a protective factor against intrateam conflict in such situations. These findings align with previous research examining the relationship between social identity and performance, which revealed a greater tendency for athletes with high social identity to act prosocially toward ingroup members (e.g., more co-operatively; Van Vugt et al. 2000) and individuals with low social identity to blame other members of the team after a loss (Zucchermaglio, 2005).

Uneven representation of genders among the three narratives described within this study suggests that gender may represent an underlying influence on the relationship between social identity and intrateam behavior. While all of the female athletes that were interviewed told stories that aligned with a family-oriented team narrative, male teams were represented among all three narrative types. Although gender has not been explicitly examined in relation to social identity in youth sport, past moral behavior research has shown that females tend to demonstrate higher levels of morality than males; in particular, females demonstrated more prosocial behavior toward opponents in laboratory experiments (Sage & Kavussanu, 2007), and lower frequencies of antisocial behavior in field studies (Coulomb- Cabagno & Rascle, 2006; Coulomb-Cagno, Rascle, & Souchon, 2005). Additionally, narrative research in and outside sport supports these gender findings (e.g., Douglass & Carless, 2006). According to masculine and performance narratives, males tend to tell stories that are relatively one-dimensional in nature (e.g., focusing on careers), whereas females reflect more multidimensional narratives (e.g., focusing on the development of relationships as well as careers) (Lieblich, Tuval-Mshiaiach & Zilber, 1998). Overall, the distribution of gender among these narratives may reflect

longstanding social norms and values in contemporary Westernized societies, such that the female athletes in this study were socialized into more family-oriented roles, while male athletes were empowered to create their own space for success (e.g., self-made men). The current work contributes to this literature base by providing qualitative accounts of moral behavior and establishing links between such behavior and social identity.

A key element of the family-oriented narrative was that athletes viewed their respective teams as analogous to a tight knit family, often referring to teammates as akin to family members. Importantly, they also identified coaches as pivotal agents in building this sense of family. Specifically, athletes described how their coaches were proactive in highlighting the importance of inclusion and respecting team members during practice and competition. These findings are consistent with school sport research (Ennis et al., 1999) and recent work in sport by Knust and Fisher (2015) who investigated NCAA Division 1 female head coaches' experiences of exemplary care within coaching. Semi-structured interviews revealed how these coaches described their role as being comparable to that of a parent caring for their children. Illustrative behaviors included modeling desired familial behaviour and discussing desirable behavior with athletes (Knust & Fisher, 2015). Compared with the collegiate coaches interviewed in the work by Knust and Fisher (2015), the youth athletes aligning with a family-oriented team narrative discussed similar coaching behaviors in terms of fostering family environments in sport teams. Thus, such behaviors may be effective in generating cohesive 'family' environments across a range of coaching contexts.

In contrast, athletes across all three narratives told different stories about how their coaches responded to inappropriate intrateam athlete behavior, specifically with respect to the effectiveness of certain coaching behaviors in dealing with such conduct. For instance, coaches

of teams in the family-oriented narrative responded to inappropriate teammate behavior by meeting with the team as a whole, or individually punishing players that exhibited such behavior (e.g., reprimanding or benching them). Alternatively, coaches of teams adhering to the dominance-oriented narrative responded to negative intrateam behavior by engaging in verbal reprimands or limiting playing time. Unlike coaches in the family-oriented narrative, coaches of dominance-oriented teams did not commonly address antisocial intrateam behavior through team communication. Whilst previous research has consistently identified the salient influence of the coach on team dynamics (e.g., Taylor & Bruner, 2012) and young athletes' behavior toward opponents (e.g., Allan & Côté, 2016; Traclet et al., 2011), far less work has examined the coach's role in shaping social identity and intrateam moral behavior. Based on the current findings and the recent work with caring, collegiate coaches (Knust & Fisher, 2015), as well as the considerable amount of research indicating the important influence of coaches on athletes' attitudes and displays of aggression in sport (e.g., Shapcott et al., 2007), more detailed examinations of the strategies used by youth coaches to promote social identity, foster prosocial intrateam behavior, and curb antisocial teammate behavior are necessitated.

Although the current study contributed important knowledge concerning social identity and moral behavior in youth sport through use of a novel approach, there are some limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the reflections of the young athletes were collected at just one time point. It was therefore not possible to analyse how these narratives may have evolved over time or in relation to other potential influencing factors such as competing for playoffs, or player turnover. Second, the interviews were relatively short in duration for narrative interviews (i.e., 15-35 minutes), which may have limited the depth and/or richness of our narrative analyses. The abridged durations may have been due to the interview setting (e.g., proximity to a busy ice

rink), the timing of the interviews (e.g., immediately before or after practice), and the young age of the participants. It is also possible that some of the interview questions could have been tailored more specifically to encourage these young athletes to elaborate more on the stories they told. Future researchers may consider following up on this study with focus groups, as previous research has identified focus groups as an effective method for promoting in-depth discussions with youth participants (e.g., Humbert et al., 2008). A third limitation was the characteristics used to identify the participants selected for interviews (e.g., captain, verbal cheerleader). Consideration of team members in different roles or bearing other characteristics (e.g., quiet team member) may have provided important insight or differing perspectives with respect to social identity and intrateam moral behaviour. Fourth, to accommodate one-on-one interviews being conducted simultaneously with teams, multiple trained interviewers were needed. We acknowledge the existence of multiple realities and the role of the interviewer in constructing knowledge, and accept this bias as both a limitation and a natural part of the research process.

In addition to those identified above, additional future research directions are encouraged. First, researchers are encouraged to further investigate the influence of athletes' prosocial behaviors within teams in which antisocial behavior dominates, such as those seen in the dominance-oriented narrative here. Although there was a clear indication of how antisocial behavior was addressed by coaches and athletes in family-oriented teams, it was less clear how prosocial behavior was responded to in dominance-oriented teams. Finally, given that some evidence emerged suggesting the relationship between social identity and moral behavior could possibly be bidirectional, future longitudinal research is encouraged, as such designs would provide much greater insight on the ordering of the effects of social identity and moral behaviour on one another (see Penner et al., 2005).

Given the present findings identifying the critical role of the coach in fostering team social identity and monitoring intrateam moral behavior, the study has practical implications for coaches and sport practitioners. First, based on the results, coaches should attempt to develop a strong team identity to foster feelings akin to a close family group to help mitigate the potential effects of competition such as harmful intrateam behavior occurring following losses. One strategy for coaches to consider is team building, a popular, effective group development approach that may be tailored toward achieving a strong social identity. Although empirical studies have recommended and/or reported the potential benefits of team building to the athlete and team (Bruner, Eys, Beauchamp, & Côté, 2013; Martin, Carron, Burke, 2009, interventions have yet to specifically examine the influence of team building on social identity in youth sport. Given the emerging benefits of social identity on young athlete development (Bruner, Boardley et al., 2014) and moral behavior (Bruner, Eys et al. 2014), further research is encouraged to examine the influence of a team building intervention on social identity, youth development and intrateam moral behavior.

Conclusion

The present study used narrative inquiry to advance our understanding of social identity and intrateam moral behavior and their interrelationships on youth ice hockey teams. This research allowed youth to share in their own words how the experiences on their teams shaped their social identity and treatment of teammates. In doing so, the study has advanced our theoretical understanding of the interactions between social identity and intrateam moral behavior in youth sport. Understanding team dynamics and teammate behavior is an important step for coaches and sport practitioners to build a healthy sport team environment rich in youth development and participation.

Acknowledgements

Preparation of this manuscript was supported by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) Insight Development Grant (#430-2013-000950) and an Insight Grant (#435-2014-0038). The authors also wish to thank the hockey associations, coaches and young athletes that participated in the study.

References

Allan, V. & Côté, J. (2016). A cross-sectional analysis of coaches' observed emotion-behavior profiles and adolescent athletes' self-reported developmental outcomes. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 28*(3), 321-337. doi:10.1080/10413200.2016.1162220

Allen, J. B. (2003). Social motivation in youth sport. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *25*(4), 551-567.

Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action. In W.M. Kurtines & J.L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development: Theory, research, and applications* (Vol. 1, pp. 71-129). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *3*, 193–209.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 497-529. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.117.3.497

Bruner, M.W., Boardley, I.D., Allan, V., Root, Z., Buckham, S., Forrest, C., & Côté, J. (2016). Examining social identity and intrateam moral behaviours in competitive youth ice hockey using stimulated recall. *Journal of Sport Sciences.* doi: 10.1080/02640414.2016.1243797

Bruner, M. W., Boardley, I., & Côté, J. (2014). Social identity and prosocial and antisocial behavior in youth sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 15*(1), 56-64. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.09.003

Bruner, M. W., Dunlop, W., & Beauchamp, M. R. (2014). A social identity perspective on group processes in sport and exercise. In M. R. Beauchamp & M. A. Eys (Ed.), *Group Dynamics in Exercise and Sport Psychology* (2nd ed., pp 38-52), New York, NY: Routledge.

Bruner, M. W., Eys, M. A., Beauchamp, M., & Côté, J. (2013). Examining the origins of team building in sport: A citation network and genealogical approach. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice, 17,* 30-41. doi:10.1037/a0030114

Bruner, M. W., Eys, M. A., Wilson, K. S., & Côté, J. (2014). Group cohesion and positive youth development in team sport athletes. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, *3*(4), 219-227. doi:10.1037/spy0000017

Cameron, J. E. (2004). A three-factor model of social identity. *Self and Identity, 3,* 239-262. doi:10.1080/13576500444000047

Camiré, M., Trudel, P., & Forneris, T. (2014). Examining how model youth sport coaches learn to facilitate positive youth development. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 19*(1), 1-17. doi:10.1080/17408989.2012.726975

Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute. (2009). Lets get active!: Planning effective communication strategies [bulletin 3]. *2008 Physical activity monitor: Facts & figures.* Ottawa, Ontario: CFLRI.

Coulomb-Cabagno, G., & Rascle, O. (2006). Team sports players' observed aggression as a function of sex, competitive level, and sport type. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36,* 1980–2000.

Coulomb-Cabagno, G., Rascle, O., & Souchon, N. (2005). Players' gender and male referees' decisions about aggression in French soccer: A preliminary study. *Sex Roles*, *52*(7), 547–553.

Douglas, K., & Carless, D. (2006). Performance, discovery, and relational narratives among women professional tournament golfers. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, *15*(2), 14–27.

Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). Prosocial development. In N. Eisenberg, & W. Damon (Eds.) (5th ed.). Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. *Social emotional and personality development* (pp. 701-778) New York: Wiley.

Ennis, C. D., Solmon, M. A., Satina, B., Loftus, S. J., Mensch, J., & McCauley, M. T. (1999). Creating a sense of family in urban schools using the "Sport for Peace" curriculum. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 70*(3), 273-285. doi:10.1080/02701367.1999.10608046

Goldman, L., Giles, H., & Hogg, M. A. (2014). Going to extremes: social identity and communication processes associated with gang membership. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 17*(6), 813–832. doi:10.1177/1368430214524289

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. B. (2001). *Intergroup relations: Essential readings*. Psychology Press, Taylor & Francis Group.

Holt, N. L., Black, D. E., Tamminen, K. A., Fox, K. R., & Mandigo, J. L. (2008). Levels of social complexity and dimensions of peer experiences in youth sport. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 30*(4), 411-431.

Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *2*(1), 204-222. doi:10.1111/j.17519004.2007.00066.x

Hornstein, H. A. (1976). *Cruelty and kindness*: *A new look at aggression and altruism*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Humbert, M. L., Chad, K. E., Bruner, M. W., Spink, K. S., Muhajarine, N., Anderson, K., Girolami, T., Odnokon, P., & Gryba, C. (2008). Using a naturalistic ecological approach to examine the factors influencing youth's physical activity across grades 7 to 12. *Health Education and Behavior*, *35*(2), 158-173. doi:10.1177/1090198106287451

Hsieh, H. & Shannon, S.E., (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277–1288. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687

Ingham, A. G., Chure, M. A., & Butt, J. (2002). From the performance principle to the development principle: every kid a winner? *Quest*, *54*(4), 308–331. doi:10.1080/00336297.2002.10491781

Kavussanu, M., & Boardley, I. D. (2012). Moral behavior. In G. Tenenbaum, R. J. Eklund, & A. Kamata (Eds.), *Handbook of measurement in sport and exercise psychology* (pp. 443-454). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Knust, S. K., & Fisher, L. A. (2015). NCAA Division 1 female head coaches' experiences of exemplary care within coaching. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, *2*(2), 94-107. doi:10.1123/iscj.2013-0045

Lemyre, F., Trudel, P., & Durand-Bush, N. (2007). How youth-sport coaches learn to coach. *Sport Psychologist, 21*(2), 191–209.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (1998). *Narrative research: Reading, analysis and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Martin, L. J., Carron, A. V., & Burke, S. M. (2009). Team building interventions in sport: A meta-analysis. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *5*, 3-18.

Mayan, M. (2009) *Essentials of Qualitative Inquiry*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press

Merrilees, C. E., Cairns, E., Taylor, L. K., Goeke-Morey, M. C., Shirlow, P., & Cummings, E. M. (2013) Social identity and youth aggressive and delinquent behaviors in a context of political violence. *Political Psychology*, *34*(5), 695-711. doi:10.1111/pops.12030

Murrell, A. J., & Gaertner, S. L. (1992). Cohesion and sport team effectiveness: the benefit of a common group identity. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, *16*(1), 1-14. doi:10.1177/019372359201600101

Næss, F. D. (2001). Narratives about young men and masculinities in organised sport in Norway. *Sport, Education and Society*, *6*(2), 125-142. doi:10.1080/13573320120084236

Nezlek, J. B., & Smith, C. V. (2005). Social identity in daily social interaction. *Self and Identity*, *4*(3), 243-261. doi:10.1080/13576500444000308

Ontario Hockey Federation. (n.d.). Ontario Hockey Federation. Retrieved February 1, 2015, from http://www.ohf.on.ca/about

Olweus, D. (1999). Sweden. In P. K. Smith, Y. Morita, J. Junger-Tas, D. Olweus, R. Catalano, & P. Slee (Eds.), *The nature of school bullying: A cross-national perspective* (pp. 7– 27). New York: Routledge.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *56*, 365–92. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070141

Perrier, M. J., Smith, B., Strachan, S. M., & Latimer-Cheung, A. E. (2014). Narratives of athletic identity after acquiring a permanent physical disability. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, *31*(2), 106-124. doi:10.1123/apaq.2012-0076

Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the Human Sciences*. London; Sage.

Rhode, D. (1997). *Speaking of sex: The denial of gender inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sage, L., & Kavussanu, M. (2007). The effects of goal involvement on moral behaviour in an experimentally manipulated competitive setting. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *29*(2), 190-207

Sage, L., Kavussanu, M., & Duda, J. (2006). Goal orientations and moral identity as predictors of prosocial and antisocial functioning in male association football players. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *24*(5), 455-466. doi:10.1080/02640410500244531

Shapcott, K. M., Bloom, G. A., & Loughead, T. M. (2007). An initial exploration of the factors influencing aggressive and assertive intentions of women ice hockey players. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, *38*(2), 145-162.

Sharp, K. (1998). The case for case studies in nursing research: The problem of generalization. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *27*(4), 785-789. doi:10.1046/j.13652648.1998.00604.x

Shields, D. L., LaVoi, N. M., Bredemeier, B. L., & Power, F. C. (2007). Predictors of poor sportspersonship in youth sports: personal attitudes and social influences. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *29*(6), 747-762.

Smith, A. (2007). Youth peer relationships in sport. In S. Jowett (Ed.), *Social psychology in sport* (pp. 41-54). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Smith, B. (2010). Narrative inquiry: Ongoing conversations and questions for sport and exercise psychology research. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *3*(1), 87-107. doi:10.1080/17509840903390937

Smith, B. (2015). Narrative analysis. In E. Lyons & A. Coyle (Eds.), *Analyzing qualitative data in psychology* (2nd ed.). London, UK: SAGE.

Smith, J. K., & Deemer, D. K. (2000). The problem of criteria in the age of relativism. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed., pp. 877-896). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE

Smith, B., & Sparkes, A. C. (2012). Narrative analysis in sport & physical culture. In K. Young & M. Atkinson (Eds.), *Qualitative research on sport and physical culture* (pp.81–101). Bingley, UK: Emerald Press.

Sparkes, A., & Smith, B. (2014). *Qualitative research in sport, exercise and health sciences. From process to product.* London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Stake, R. (1982). Naturalistic generalization. *Review Journal of Philosophy and Social Science, 7*, 1-12.

Tajfel, H. (1981*). Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., Billig, M., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *1*(2), 149-178. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420010202

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin (Ed.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Taylor, I. M., & Bruner, M. W. (2012). The social environment and developmental experiences in elite youth soccer. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *13*(4), 390-396. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.01.008

Tidwell, M. V. (2005). A social identity model of prosocial behaviors within nonprofit

organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *15*(4), 449-467. doi:10.1002/nml.82

Traclet, A., Romand, P., Moret, O., & Kavussanu, M. (2011). Antisocial behavior in soccer: A qualitative study of moral disengagement. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *9*(2), 143-155. doi:10.1080/1612197X.2011.567105

United States Census Bureau. (2012). Participation in selected sport activities 2009 (table 1249). Reitrieved from http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2012/ tables/12s1249.pdf.

USA Hockey. (2014). 2013 - 2014 Season final registration reports. Retrieved from http://assets.ngin.com/attachments/document/0039/9585/2013-14_Final_Report.pdf

Van Der Vegt, G., Emans, B., & Van De Vliert, E. (2000). Team members' affective responses to patterns of intragroup interdependence and job complexity. *Journal of Management*, *26*(4), 633–655. doi:10.1177/014920630002600403

Van Vugt, M., Biel, A., Snyder, M., Tyler, T. (2000). Perspective on cooperation in modern society: Helping the self, the community, and society. In M. Van Vugt, M. Snyder, T.R. Tyler, A. Biel (Eds.), *Cooperation in Modern Society: Promoting the welfare of communities, states, and organisations* (pp. 3-24). London: Routledge.

Wagner, W. G. (1996). Facilitating optimal development in adolescence: Introductory remarks. *Counseling Psychologist*, *24*(3), 357-359. doi:10.1177/0011000096243001

Zucchermaglio, C. (2005). Who wins and who loses: The rhetorical manipulation of social identities in a soccer team. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, *9*(4), 219-238. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.9.4.219

Table1

Narrative summaries

	Family Orientation	**Performance Orientation**	**Dominance Orientation**
Team Demographics	Male (*n*=3) and Female (*n*=3) teams (*k*=6, Peewee *n*=4, Bantam *n*=2)	A male (*n*=1) midget team	Male (*n*=2) Peewee (*n*=1) and Bantam (*n*=1) team
Characteristics of Main Themes			
Social Identity	Strong	Moderate	Weak
Team Environment	Consistently cohesive and supportive	Contingent upon performance expectations and outcomes	Platform for dominance and aggression
Moral Behavior	High prosocial and low antisocial	Contingent upon performance expectations and outcomes	Low prosocial and high antisocial
Interrelationships among Characteristics of Main Themes			
Social Identity, Team Environment & Moral Behavior	A tight-knit, family-oriented team environment contributes to a strong sense of social identity. Relationships are valued over and above team performance and outcomes. Out of respect and unity, teammates are more likely to engage in prosocial and avoid antisocial behavior.	With a prioritization on winning, the team environment is a reflection of competition outcomes. During times of success, the team environment is supportive and likely to be characterized by prosocial intrateam behavior. However, unmet performance expectations contribute to 'self-policing' and antisocial behavior among teammates. Correspondingly, the team's sense of social identity fluctuated.	The team environment serves as a platform for displays of traditional masculine dominance and aggression, concurrent with an emphasis on winning and performance. These displays typically involve execution of antisocial behavior toward teammates, which appears to negatively impact social identity.

Dominant Social & Cultural Narratives

	Traditional feminine perspectives & western family values	Prioritization on performance	Traditional masculine dominance & aggression

925